



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/474,974 | 12/29/1999 | BALWINDER S. SAMRA | 17207-00004 | 3025 |

7590 10/20/2003

JOHN S BEULICK
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE SUITE 2600
ST LOUIS, MO 631022740

EXAMINER

VAN DOREN, BETH

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

3623

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/474,974

Applicant(s)

SAMRA ET AL.

Examiner

Beth Van Doren

Art Unit

3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 August 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-11, 13-16 and 18-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-11, 13-16, and 18-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a Final office action in response to communications received 08/14/03. Claims 24-27 have been added. Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-16, and 18-27 are now pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-16, 18-23, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Jackson et al. (*Strategic Database Marketing*).

3. As per claim 1, Jackson et al. discloses a method for increasing the efficiency of marketing campaigns using a targeting engine for analyzing data input and generating data output, said method including the steps of:

using historical data to determine a target group based upon a plurality of models embedded within and executed by the targeting engine, the targeting engine is configured to determine a sequential order for combining the models to define the target group, and combine the models in the determined sequential order to define the target group and determine a risk factor for the target group (See page 173, section 1, page 174, sections 1 and 2, page 175, table 11-1, page 176, all, page 177, sections 1-4, page 179, sections 1 and 2, page 180, section 1, page 181, sections 1 and 2, page 182, all, page 183, section 1, page 184, section 1, and page 185, sections 1, wherein a database is maintained with past data about customers (buying patterns,

Art Unit: 3623

past purchases, time of purchases, etc.). Multiple models are built to predict customer behavior. For example, two models would be built, one representing a customer's likelihood to respond to an offer, the second representing the customer's risk factor. The plural models are combined by the targeting engine (i.e. the computer application with databases and statistical tools that manipulates the data of the database by inserting each customer's data into the variables of the plural models and solves each model in a specific order to determine a score for each customer (two sequential orderings occur: the variables within these models are weighted and ordered in a specific sequence and the a primary model is applied first and then the secondary model). This end result of the targeting engine's combining is both (1) the generation of a ranked list of the customers which is broken into target groupings and (2) a risk factor (or aspect) being calculated and considered for each target grouping through the execution of the second model); and

directing the marketing campaign towards the target group determined by the models (See page 174, section 2, page 176, all, and page 177, section 1, wherein the marketing campaign is directed towards the target group determined using the models).

4. As per claim 2, Jackson et al. further discloses a method wherein said step of using historical data to determine a target group based upon a plurality of models further comprises the step of combining models to determine a depth of a targeted mailing (See pages 162, page 174, section 2, page 176, all, and page 177, section 1. Segmentation is revealed as a way to manipulate the records in the database to produce relevant groups to target. On page 165, the 60-20 rule is revealed, explaining how about 20 percent of the records in the seemingly large database account for 80 percent of a company's business. Again, a method of market analysis using appropriate segmentation and modeling determines the appropriate depth of the database to

Art Unit: 3623

target market. See page 174, section 2, page 176, all, and page 177, section 1, wherein modeling reveals to the marketer which segments to choose (the depth) based on the modeling. See also pages 184-185, which disclose the use of multiple models to properly fit marketing needs and properly predict customer behavior).

5. As per claim 3, Jackson et al. teaches a method wherein said step of using historical data to determine a target group based upon a plurality of models further comprises the step of combining models to determine the likelihood of a customer response (See pages 40-41 in which Jackson et al. discusses using an RFM, or recency, frequency, and monetary, analysis that identifies the “best customers” with the best buying potential and also performing a comparison analysis on these prediction models to locate the segments of customers in the database with the best buying potential. See also page 174 in which Jackson et al. discusses scoring models that predict how individuals will behave in the future and their likelihood of response or purchase. See also pages 184-185, which disclose the use multiple models to properly fit marketing needs and properly predict customer behavior).

6. As per claim 4, Jackson et al. further discloses a method wherein said step of using historical data to determine a target group based upon a plurality of models further comprises the step of combining models to generate a potential customer list (See again pages 40-43 which discusses creating a marketing list by identifying the best current customers as well as identifying new customers to market products to. See page 174, section 2, page 176, all, and page 177, section 1, wherein the customers are rated and placed in an ordered list, and then potential customers are taken from this list. See also pages 184-185, which disclose the use of multiple models to properly fit marketing needs and properly predict customer behavior).

7. As per claim 6, Jackson et al. discloses a method wherein said step of using historical data to determine a target group based upon a plurality of models further comprises the step of combining models to determine expected profitability per customer of a marketing campaign (See pages 174-177 in which Jackson et al. discusses using scoring models to determine the profitability of each customer and then segmenting the customer database based on this information as well as the customer's likelihood of response. Each segment is evaluated as to its profitability. See also pages 184-185, which disclose the use of multiple models to properly fit marketing needs and properly predict customer behavior).

8. As per claim 7, Jackson et al. teaches a method wherein said step of using historical data to determine a target group based upon a plurality of models further comprises the step of combining models to determine the expected profitability per product of a marketing campaign (See page 158-163, specifically page 163, which discusses modeling individual customers to conduct product segmentation which identifies target audiences that have the highest probability of purchasing the identified product, thus creating the most revenue. See page 180, section 1, and page 181, all, wherein the scoring models represent the expected profitability of a product. See also pages 184-185, which disclose the use of multiple models to properly fit marketing needs and properly predict customer behavior).

9. As per claim 8, Jackson et al. discloses a method wherein said step of directing the marketing campaign towards the target group determined by the models further comprises the step of rank ordering accounts (See pages 173-177 in which modeling to predict future behavior of customers is disclosed. Specifically see page 174, which discusses using these models to rank

Art Unit: 3623

every individual in the database based on his/her respective accounts and future buying potential).

10. As per claim 9, Jackson et al. further discusses a method wherein said step of directing the marketing campaign toward the target group determined by the models further comprises the step of segmenting accounts based on customer demographics (See pages 158-163, specifically page 163, which discusses modeling individual customers to conduct demographic segmentation which ranks and sorts customers or ranks and sorts products and services based on attributes such as age, occupation, and marital status. See also page 177, section 4).

11. As per claim 10, Jackson et al. further teaches a method wherein said step of directing the marketing campaign toward the target group determined by the models further comprises the step of identifying cross-sell targets (See page 44 in which Jackson et al. discusses matching the modeled predictive profiles of the customers in the database with the profiles of either products or other customers to locate cross-sell opportunities. See also pages 86-87, which again discusses identifying cross-sell targets based on profile information stored in the marketing database.).

12. As per claim 11, Jackson et al. discloses a system configured to increase the efficiency of marketing campaigns, said system comprising:

a customer database which includes customer demographics and historical data (See pages 27-30 wherein Jackson et al. discuss the demographic and historical data contained in the customer database. See also page 173, section 1, page 177, section 4, page 179, section 1, page 181, section 2, 182, all, and 183, section 1);

a targeting engine for analyzing data input and generating data output, said targeting engine having a plurality of models stored thereon, said targeting engine configured to access said historical data, determine a sequential order for combining the models to define the target group, and combine said models in the determined sequential order to determine a target group for marketing and determine a risk factor for the target group (See page 173, section 1, page 174, sections 1 and 2, page 175, table 11-1, page 176, all, page 177, sections 1-4, page 179, sections 1 and 2, page 180, section 1, page 181, sections 1 and 2, page 182, all, page 183, section 1, page 184, section 1, and page 185, sections 1, wherein a database is maintained with past data about customers (buying patterns, past purchases, time of purchases, etc.). Multiple models are built to predict customer behavior. For example, two models would be built, one representing a customer's likelihood to respond to an offer, the second representing the customer's risk factor. The plural models are combined by the targeting engine (i.e. the computer application with databases and statistical tools that manipulates the data of the database by inserting each customer's data into the variables of the plural models and solves each model in a specific order to determine a score for each customer (two sequential orderings occur: the variables within these models are weighted and ordered in a specific sequence and the a primary model is applied first and then the secondary model). This end result of the targeting engine's combining is both (1) the generation of a ranked list of the customers which is broken into target groupings and (2) a risk factor (or aspect) being calculated and considered for each target grouping through the execution of the second model); and

a graphical user interface for accessing a customer database and displaying data output (See pages 119-122 in which Jackson et al. discuss database processing systems, specifically

Art Unit: 3623

database management systems, that create, modify, and control access to the information stored in the database. As shown in figure 8-3, reports are generated through the system. See also pages 130-135 which discusses system data structures and platforms employable for system implementation. Specifically, pages 133-134 disclose the use of server technology, including PCs with LAN access to a central storage unit. As it is well known in the area of server technology, these PCs would be equipped with GUIs. See also pages 156-157, which further discuss system data structures and platforms that include tools for counting, profiling, reporting, research, and other business planning using the data stored in the database).

13. As per claim 13, Jackson et al. discloses a system further configured to use historical data in said customer database to direct a marketing campaign towards a target group determined by the plurality of models (See again page 39, wherein Jackson et al. discusses directing database-driven marketing campaigns at the right customers. See also pages 158-165 which discusses segmenting the customer database into subsets based on specific characteristics, these specific characteristics causing certain subgroups to be identified as more inclined to respond to a particular targeted marketing campaign. See also page 174, section 2, page 176, all, and page 177, section 1, wherein the marketing campaign is directed towards the target group determined using the models).

14. As per claims 14-16 and 18-21, claims 14-16 and 18-21 are system versions of claims 2-4 and 6-9, respectively. Since the specification provides nothing more than a method implemented in a network environment, claims 14-16 and 18-21 are rejected on the same grounds as the method of claims 2-4 and 6-9, respectively.

Art Unit: 3623

15. As per claim 22, Jackson et al. teaches a method wherein the step of using historical data to determine a target group further comprises the step of using historical data to determine a target group based upon a plurality of models embedded within and executed by the targeting engine wherein the targeting engine is further configured to determine a risk factor for the target group after combining each model (See page 184, section 1, and page 185, section 1, wherein the targeting engine determines the risk factor for the target group after each of the models is combined (the targeting engine computes the scores for the multiple scoring models by combining each of the multiple models in a specific order, such as the propensity to buy model is combined before the risk model. The risk factor is determined by combining the model for risk, combining the risk model in sequential order with the other models, and placing the customers in a ranked order and considering the weight of risk). For example, group 10 out of 10 groups will have the lowest risk factor, making them the least marketable decile).

16. As per claim 23, Jackson et al. teaches a system wherein said targeting engine is further configured to determine a risk factor for the target group after combining each model (See page 184, section 1, and page 185, section 1, wherein the targeting engine determines the risk factor for the target group after each of the models is combined (the targeting engine computes the scores for the multiple scoring models by combining each of the multiple models in a specific order, such as the propensity to buy model is combined before the risk model. The risk factor is determined by combining the model for risk, combining the risk model in sequential order with the other models, and placing the customers in a ranked order and considering the weight of risk). For example, group 10 out of 10 groups will have the lowest risk factor, making them the least marketable decile).

17. As per claim 27, claim 27 is a system version of claim 25. Since the specification provides nothing more than a method implemented in a network environment, claim 27 is rejected on the same grounds as the method of claim 25.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

18. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jackson et al. (*Strategic Database Marketing*).

19. As per claim 24, Jackson et al. teaches a method wherein said step of using historical data to determine a target group further comprises the step of:

storing in a database historical data for a plurality of potential customers including for each potential customer at least one of an age, a gender, a marital status, an income, a transaction history, and a transaction measure (See page 173, section 1, page 174, sections 1 and 2, page 175, table 11-1, page 176, all, page 177, sections 1-4, page 179, sections 1 and 2, page 180, section 1, page 181, sections 1 and 2, page 182, all, page 183, section 1, page 184, section 1, and page 185, sections 1, wherein a database is maintained with past data about customers (buying patterns, past purchases, time of purchases, gender, etc.));

using the historical data to determine a target group based upon a plurality of models embedded within and executed by the targeting engine (See page 173, section 1, page 174, sections 1 and 2, page 175, table 11-1, page 176, all, page 177, sections 1-4, page 179, sections 1

Art Unit: 3623

and 2, page 180, section 1, page 181, sections 1 and 2, page 182, all, page 183, section 1, page 184, section 1, and page 185, sections 1, wherein multiple models are built to predict customer behavior. For example, two models would be built, one representing a customer's likelihood to respond to an offer, the second representing the customer's risk factor. The plural models are combined by the targeting engine (i.e. the computer application with databases and statistical tools that manipulates the data of the database by inserting each customer's data into the variables of the plural models) and solves each model in a specific order to determine a score for each customer (two sequential orderings occur: the variables within these models are weighted and ordered in a specific sequence and the a primary model is applied first and then the secondary model). This end result of the targeting engine's combining is both (1) the generation of a ranked list of the customers which is broken into target groupings and (2) a risk factor (or aspect) being calculated and considered for each target grouping through the execution of the second model);

determining a sequential order for combining the models using the targeting engine to define the target group (See page 173, section 1, page 174, sections 1 and 2, page 175, table 11-1, page 176, all, page 177, sections 1-4, page 179, sections 1 and 2, page 180, section 1, page 181, sections 1 and 2, page 182, all, page 183, section 1, page 184, section 1, and page 185, sections 1, wherein the plural models would be combined using the targeting engine (i.e. the computer application with databases and statistical tools that manipulates the data of the database by inserting each customer's data into the variables of the plural models) and solves each model in a specific order to determine a score for each customer (two sequential orderings occur: the variables within these models are weighted and ordered in a specific sequence and the a primary

Art Unit: 3623

model is applied first and then the secondary model). This end result of the targeting engine's combining is both (1) the generation of a ranked list of the customers which is broken into target groupings and (2) a risk factor (or aspect) being calculated and considered for each target grouping through the execution of the second model);

combining the models in the determined sequential order to define the target group by applying a first model included in the determined sequential order to each of the plurality of potential customers included in the database to generate a first segment of only those potential customers satisfying the first model, applying a second model included in the determined sequential order to the first segment to generate a second segment of only those potential customers satisfying the combination of the first and second models (See page 177, sections 1-4, page 179, sections 1 and 2, page 180, section 1, page 181, sections 1 and 2, page 182, all, page 183, section 1, page 184, section 1, and page 185, sections 1, wherein a database is maintained with past data about customers (buying patterns, past purchases, time of purchases, etc.)). Multiple models are built to predict customer behavior. For example, two models would be built, one representing a customer's likelihood to respond to an offer, the second representing the customer's risk factor. The plural models are combined by the targeting engine and solved in a specific order to determine a score for each customer).

However, Jackson et al. does not expressly disclose applying each subsequent model included in the determined sequential order to a segment generated by the combination of each prior two models to define a target group.

Jackson et al. discusses that multiple scoring models would be used to fit the marketing need of predicting customer performance, with an example given with a primary and secondary

Art Unit: 3623

model. See page 184. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply three or more scoring models to predict customer behavior in order to more accurately predict the customer segments that most likely will perform positively to the needs of the company. See page 184.

20. As per claim 25, Jackson et al. teaches a method wherein said step of combining the models in the determined sequential order to define the target group further comprises combining the models in the determined sequential order to determine a risk factor for each potential customer within the target group See page 173, section 1, page 174, sections 1 and 2, page 175, table 11-1, page 176, all, page 177, sections 1-4, page 179, sections 1 and 2, page 180, section 1, page 181, sections 1 and 2, page 182, all, page 183, section 1, page 184, section 1, and page 185, sections 1, wherein the result of the targeting engine's combining is a risk factor (or aspect) being calculated and considered for each target grouping through the execution of the second model).

21. As per claim 26, claim 26 is a system version of claims 24. Since the specification provides nothing more than a method implemented in a network environment, claim 26 is rejected on the same grounds as the method of claim 24.

Response to Arguments

22. Applicant's arguments with regard to Jackson et al. (*Strategic Database Marketing*) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In the remarks, the Applicant argues that Jackson et al. does not teach or suggest (1) a targeting engine configured to determine a sequential order for combining models to define a target group, and combining the models in the determined sequential order to define the target group (and instead teaches a process where

Art Unit: 3623

predictors are weighted but the sequential order of combining the predictors makes no difference), (2) a method or system for increasing the efficiency of market campaigns, or (3) the method or system recited in newly added claims 24-27, and that (4) the output of Jackson et al. does not include each potential customer that satisfies the combined models and is not based on the order in which the models are combined, but rather the output includes all of the potential customers in a database with a total point number assigned which does not necessarily indicate which predictors were applied to the particular customer.

In response to argument (1) of the Applicant, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner first reminds applicant that limitations in the claims are afforded the broadest reasonable interpretation and that in this instance there are no specific recitations in the claim as to how the sequential order is determined, as to how the models are combined, as to what the models are or represent, as to how the target group is specifically defined, as to what a target group specifically is, etc. In the broadest reasonable interpretation, a sequential order is a following of one thing after another or an arranged set of quantities. So an equation is an ordered set of quantities because it ruled by the laws of mathematics, which requires, for example, that multiplication occurs before addition (in the absence of parenthesis, etc.) and that at the stage of addition, it occurs left to right. Model, in its broadest reasonable interpretation, means type or representation. Therefore, multiple models are built to predict customer behavior (see page 184, section 1). For example, two models would be built, one representing a customer's likelihood to respond to an offer, the second representing the customer's risk factor. The plural models are combined by the targeting engine. Examiner points out that a "targeting engine" as recited in the claims is merely a tool used for performing targeting and therefore the computer application

Art Unit: 3623

with databases and statistical tools of Jackson et al. is proper as a targeting engine. The targeting engine (i.e. computer application) manipulates the data of the database by inserting each customer's data into the variables of the plural models (i.e. embeds) and solving each of the plural models (i.e. executing) in a specific order to determine a score for each customer. See at least 180, section 1, page 181, sections 1 and 2, page 182, all, 184, section 1, in which two sequential orderings occur: (1) the variables within these models are weighted and ordered in a specific sequence and (2) the a primary model is applied first and then the secondary model. The targeting engine performs the combination (i.e. joining of the plural models together with the data to produce a score for each customer) which results in both (1) the generation of a ranked list of the customers which is broken into target groupings and (2) a risk factor (or aspect) being calculated and considered for each target grouping through the execution of the second model. Sectioned groups of a ranked list, with marketing campaigns directed towards certain groups of the ranked list, are target groups, in the broadest reasonable interpretation of term.

In response to argument (2) of the Applicant, the recitation "a method (or system) for increasing the efficiency of market campaigns" has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951). Examiner further points out that the steps recited in the body of the claims are directed to increasing the efficiency of market campaigns. Therefore, since Jackson et al. teaches the body

of the claim and since the recitation argued is in the preamble of the claims, Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant.

In response to argument (3) of the Applicant, Examiner reminds the Applicant that these claims were added in the communications received on 08/14/03. Therefore, the Examiner has addressed the limitations of claims 24-27 in the rejections set forth above.

In response to argument (4) of the Applicant, Examiner points out that the only recitation of the term output in the claims is in the limitation “a graphical user interface for accessing customer database and displaying data output”. This limitation does not expressly recite what data is output, just that some data is output and displayed on a graphical user interface. Therefore, the data output by Jackson et al. is sufficient for the claimed limitation, as set forth above.

Conclusion

23. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3623

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Beth Van Doren whose telephone number is (703) 305-3882.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (703) 305-9643. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

bvd
bvd

October 8, 2003


TARIQ R. HAFIZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600